ANTICHRIST

Vnmasked in two Treatiſes.

10.

THE FIRST,
An Anſwer unto two *Pædobaptiſts*,
Dan. Featly, D. D.
AND
Stephen Marſhall, B.D.
The Arguments for Childrens
Baptiſme opened, and
anſwered.

The Second,
The man of Sinne diſcovered in
Doctrine; the root and foundation of
Antichriſt laid open.

By *Hen. Denne.*

MATTH. 15. 13.
Everie plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, ſhall be rooted up.

Printed for the Edification of the Church, and
Information of the world. 1645.

To the Church of God, Grace, Mercie, and Peace, &c.

BRethren, beloved in the Lord: when the providence of our God had brought me a priſoner unto London, it cam to paſſe, that almoſt as ſoon as I came into Priſon, there appeared a book intituled, The Dipper Dipt, &c. which when I had ſeene, I did preſently hold my ſelfe in duty engaged to defend the truth, againſt the Adverſary. The Booke of what temper it is, you know. But non licet nobis eſſe tam diſertis, we may not give railing for railing: we have not ſo learned Chriſt: The Book is great, yet we found the whole ſtrength of it to lye in ten Arguments, which are brought for the juſtification of Childrens Baptiſme. I ſhall let all other things paſſe, as unworthy of an Anſwer, and addreſſe my ſelfe unto the anſwer of theſe onely. I did proffer to diſpute the ten Arguments with him face to face; the firſt whereof we did debate, and account thereof is given. That we went no further this is the reaſon: Some worſhipfull Gentlemen deſiring to hear, I was very willing. But the Dr. would not admit of them, without an Order from the State; but would only debate the matter in private, and not in preſence of (only) 4 auditors. And whilſt theſe things were thus in debate, I received a Meſſage from him by the mouth of a brother, that if I would write, he would defend his Arguments. I have now written as briefely as I could, and yet as largely as the time would permit.

I have joyned with him Maſter Marſhalls book concerning the Baptiſme of Infants, which I had taken into my

hands to examine) *whilst I was a prisoner in Cambridge: And now finding these two to joyne together, in this one thing, and to use for the most part the same Arguments, I have joyned them in the Answer. As for their Replies unto our Objections, I meddle not with, but leave them to others. It will be a sufficient taske for me to shew, that their building is upon the sand. I present this Treatise unto you, desiring your favourable correction, if in any thing I have swerved from the truth. If you should bee pleased to command my pen further, unto this, or unto another more weighty subject; which calls for all our labours, viz. That the efficacy, and extent of Christs death may appeare unto the world, which yet in grtat part lyes hidden and obscure. I shall be willing to stoop unto your command herein, and endeavour to become your servant in the Lords worke: provided that you all assist me with a plentifull streame of your prayers, that wisedome may be given unto me, that so great a work may be carried and managed by the power of the Spirit of God, that gain-sayers may have their mouthes for ever stopped. Brethren farewell.* The grace of our Lord Iesus Christ be with you all. *Amen.*

From Prison in the Lord
Peters house. *Febr.* 22.
1634.

He that is most unworthy the name of a Brother,

HEN. DENNE.

THE PAEDOBAPTISTS:

Dan. Featly, D. D.

AND

Stephen Marſhall, B. D.

oppugned: their Arguments opened, and anſwered.

WHen the Woman cloathed with the Sun, having the Moon under her feet, and a Crowne of twelve Stars upon her head, cryed travailing in birth, ready to be delivered, Behold a wonder in Heaven, *A great red Dragon having ſeven heads, and ten hornes, and ſeven Crownes upon his heads*: And his Tayle drew the third part of the Stars of heaven, and caſt them to the earth: And the Dragon ſtood before the woman, which was ready to be delivered, *to devoure her childe, when ſhe had brought it forth.* Rev. 12.

Never was the *Church of Chriſt* in travaile, ready to be delivered, of any truth formed in her wombe,

but as ready is that *ten horned Dragon*, to devoure the fruit. When the Church travailed in paine, ready to be delivered, and to bring forth the *Doctrine of Iuſtification* in *Martine Luthers* dayes; wee ſee Cardinall *Cajetan* in ſpecial', and the reſt of the *Scarlet Conclave*, ready to ſwallow up both Mother and Iſſue, had not the Providence of God, carryed the defendors of Truth *upon Eagles wings*; and mightily defended them.

Our owne experience teacheth us in theſe our dayes, wherein the ſhadowes begin to vaniſh, and the night to paſſe away, and the *Sun* of righteouſneſſe to draw neare unto our *Horizon*. How many adverſaries doe now beſtirre themſelves, with policy and force, to keep us (if it were poſſible) in perpetuall darkneſſe, and to hinder the riſing of the Sun in our hearts.

Among the reſt, the Church is now travailing, ready to be delivered, and to bring forth the *Doctrine of the Baptiſme of Water*, raked up heretofore in an imitation of *Pædobaptiſme*: The truth of the Ordinance and Inſtitution of the Lord *Ieſus*, lying covered with Cuſtome and Practice, and a pretended face of Antiquity. The Lord hath been pleaſed at this day, to put into the hearts and tongues of ſome, to ſtand up in the defence of his truth, (againſt the *daring Face* of Error) who doe now labour, ready to bee delivered. But we ſee how many Champions ready armed, are come forth with *reviling ſpeeches*, and *raylng accuſations*, to daſh the countenance of this new borne Babe: and if this will not, to execute *Impriſonment* on the one hand, and *wiſh and threaten Baniſhment*, or worſe on the other hand, unto thoſe that ſhall dare

to

to uphold, or maintaine that which in conſcience they are perſwaded to be the truth.

Amongſt the multitude of oppoſers, I ſhall ſingle out two, with whom I will adventure to encounter, to try the ſtrength of their weapons, and force of their Armes, though I fight upon very unequall termes.

The firſt is Dr. *Featly*, (my fellow Priſoner) though not for the like Cauſe: who ſetteth on us with great might: As the *Red Dragon* hath *ten hornes*, ſo hath he *ten ſeverall Arguments*, whereby as with ſo many *hornes*, hee puſheth at the Truth to throw it downe to the ground, and to ſet up his long practiſed Baptiſme of Infants.

The ſecond is Maſter *Marſhall*: The ſound of whoſe name is enough to ſtrike terror to a *Priſoner*, who commeth forth more like a Lambe than the other, and hath *two Hornes*, or Arguments, wherewith he ſeeketh to ſtrengthen himſelfe, and to weaken his Adverſaries. Theſe twaine, though the appearance of them be farre different, yet is their voyce the ſame: though he pretend but two, he uſeth indeed moſt of the other. I ſhall obſerve their owne method, and firſt ſet downe the ſtate of the Queſtion, and then weigh their Arguments in the Ballance as they lye in order.

The ſtate of the Queſtion ſet downe by Dr. *Featly* is this, *page* 39.

The children of ſuch parents who profeſſe Chriſtian Religion, and are members of the viſible Church, ſith they are comprized within Gods Covenant made to the faithfull Children of Abraham, *and their ſeed, may and ought*

to receive the Seale of that Covenant, which was Circumcision under the Law, but now is Baptisme.

The state of the Question in Master *Marshall, page 3.*

Whether the Infants of such as were, or might have beene stiled Beleevers and Saints in the Apostles dayes, and writings, are to bee admitted to the Sacrament of Baptisme?

Vnto this state of the Question layd thus downe by these two; I shall not speake any thing of the difference that I doe believe is betweene them, lest I should seeme rather to be contentious, than to search after the truth. Onely I shall desire, that the cunning craftinesse of men, may bee a little discovered. Are not these the men, who have without any scruples for many yeares together, Baptized, or caused to be Baptized all Infants, of any parents whatsoever? And now being to justifie their practise in the face of the world, doe state the Question, whether the Infants of Saints are to be Baptized? I must tell you plainely the *state of your Question* is not of the same latitude with your *Practise*, but too narrow for it. VVhat are all the Parents in *Lambeth, Acton, Finchingfield* become Saints now? not any couple of them unbeleevers? will you now begin to sow pillowes under the Armeholes of your Parishioners? will you now begin to say of them, as those Conspirators did of the people, *Num. 16 3. All the Congregation is holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them?*

Let me speak unto you the Parishioners, and Inhabitants of these places: Have you not sometimes heard from their Pulpits such words as these: That most

moſt *of you are in a damnable eſtate and condition?* That there are not ten of you have the *knowledge of God, or his Son Ieſus Chriſt?* and yet now in the ſtate of this Queſtion, yee are *Saints, Beleevers, viſible Members of a Church, &c.* Surely what dealing is this? if you did appeare to them ſo to be. They did ill to give you ſuch Language. But if you were indeed other perſons, and did appeare unto them otherwiſe, they did evill to *Baptiſe* your Infants. But I will ſay no more of the ſtate of the Queſtion: Now follow the Arguments.

Argument 1. 39. *Dr. Featly.*

That which extends to all Nations, belongeth to children as well as men: for children are a great part, if not the halfe of all Nations.

But Chriſts command of Baptizing, extendeth to all Nations, Matth. 28. 19. *Goe therefore teach all Nations, Baptizing them.* And Mark 15.16. *Preach the Goſpell to every creature: he that beleeveth, and is Baptized ſhall be ſaved.*

Ergo, *Chriſts Command of Baptizing, belongeth to children; and they ought to bee Baptized as well as men.*

Page 38. *We know that in every Nation, the Children make a great part of the Nation, and are alwayes included, under every adminiſtration to the Nation, whether promiſes, or threatnings; priviledges, or burthens; mercies, or judgements, unleſſe they be excepted.* *Mr. Mar. ſhall.*

Thus farre it ſeemes, that theſe two ſpeake, both by one and the ſame Spirit: The Argument in both of them being one and the ſame. And how mighty ſoever, and invincible ſoever this argument

ſeemeth, it will be found lighter than vanity, being full of deceit, and falſehood; neither of the Propoſitions being true. For the firſt, it is plainly denyed: *For ſomething may extend to all Nations, which doth not belong to every particular perſon in the Nation, nor yet unto every condition of men in the Nation.* For it is written, *Gen.* 22. 18. *In thy ſeed ſhall all the Nations of the earth be bleſſed.* Now would not this be ſtrange reaſoning: That which extends it ſelfe to all Nations, muſt needs extend it ſelfe to the halfe, or greater part of the Nations. But the bleſſing in the ſeed of *Abraham* extends it ſelfe to all Nations.

Therefore the bleſſing extends it ſelfe to the halfe, or greater part of the Nations.

If this bee granted, ſee what will follow. They that live and dye in unbeliefe, are one halfe of the Nations; nay nine tens of the Nations: Therefore the bleſsing which extends it ſelfe to all Nations, muſt needs (by this reaſoning extend it ſelfe to thoſe that live and dye in unbeliefe; who are by farre the greater part of the Nations. Thus ſhould we argue contrary to the Scripture, which ſaith, that *Abraham is the Father of them that believe. Romans* 4. 11. And they which are of Faith, are bleſſed with faithfull *Abraham, Gal.* 3. 9. Thus is the falſehood of this Propoſition diſcovered.

But Maſter *Marſhall*, (who is the ſubtilleſt of the twaine) layeth us downe a Propoſition ſomething varying in words; but ayming at the ſame marke: to wit, *That Children are alwayes included under every adminiſtration to the Nation, unleſſe they be excepted.*

Is

Is it poſsible that Maſter *Marſhalls* underſtanding, or at leaſt his tongue, ſhou'd thus range from the truth? and that in the Pulpit? and in a Lecture appoynted by the *Honourable Houſe of Commons*, in a Sermon premeditated, penned, printed, and publiſhed? Surely, how doth it behoove us to take heed both what, and how, and whom wee heare? How dangerous a Rock is it to build upon man, or the ſon of man, ſubject to ſo many infirmities, paſsions, and errors? O poore ſoules, how oft are you hurried into groſſe and palpable errors? having your ſoules poſſeſt with an over-weening conceit of the fidelity, truth, and ſincerity of man. When a *Monk* brought a poyſoned Cup to King *Iohn*, he dranke his death deeply without any ſuſpicion at all. For as was the ſuperſtition of thoſe dayes, who wou'd have deemed poyſon to have beene mingled, in a Cup preſented, and taſted by a holy *Monke*. I ſay therefore againe, Take heed and beware what you heare. But you will ſay, what is the matter, where is the falſehood?

Doth not hee ſay, that *every adminiſtration to the Nation includeth Children, unleſſe they bee exception?*

Firſt, is not the preaching of the word of the Goſpell an adminiſtration of God? to a *Nation*, to *all Nations*, to *every Creature*? Mark 16. Yet Doctor *Featly* hath granted unto mee in a Conference, that it doth not extend it ſelfe unto little Children in the Cradle, of three or foure dayes old. And yet are they not in expreſſe termes excluded.

Secondly, was not the *Paſſeover*, a Nationall adminiſtration

niſtration to the people of the *Iewes*, and children of nine dayes old no where excepted, from eating the *Paſſeover*: and yet it pleaſeth Maſter *Marſhall* to denie that children did eate the *paſſeover*. pag 52. I ſpeake not this becauſe I beleeve little children did not eate of the *paſſeover*, but that I may wound *Goliah* with his owne ſword.

Thirdly, he that beleeveth not ſhall be damned, and children are not excepted.

Fourthly, is not the breaking of bread a Nationall adminiſtration, as he is pleaſed to call it: But where can hee prove that children are any where excepted from the Lords Supper, rather than from baptiſme. For in that he ſaith, pag. 5. *That infants are capable of the grace of baptiſme we are ſure, not ſure that they are capable of the grace ſigned and ſealed in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.* How is this; doth baptiſme ſeale one grace, and the Lords Supper another? ſo hee will make us beleeve but it is not yet proved.

One is our birth, and the other our food he ſaith: but theſe are but words without weight.

Let us ſee whether the grace ſealed in both bee not the ſame: what doth baptiſme hold out unto us? Remiſſion of ſinns *Act.* 2. 38. Bee baptiſed unto remiſſion of ſinns.

Iohn preached the baptiſme of repentance unto remiſſion of ſins, *Mar.* 1. 4. now doth not the Supper hold forth the ſame? *Mat.* 26. 28. *This is my bloud of the new Teſtament, which is ſhed for many, for remiſſion of ſins.* Let any man come forth, and ſhew me one grace held forth in the Supper, which is not held forth in Baptiſme. Will hee ſay that children ought not to receive

ceive the Lords Supper, becauſe it is ſaid, *Let a man examine himſelfe, &c.* Wee ſay againe, that ſo its ſaid; *He that beleeveth and is baptiſed: and if thou beleeveſt with all thine heart, thou mayſt* . if hee ſay this is meant of men of yeares; we ſay the ſame of the other; ſo that it appeares, that children are no more excepted, from one ordinance, than another; being indeede equally excepted from both.

But if it were true, and granted, yet will not the argument hold, for wee ſhall finde children excepted. And therfore to the *minor* propoſition of the argument, we ſay, That the *command of baptizing, doth not extend it ſelfe to all perſons in or among the Nations, without any reſtriction, or exception*; for if ſo, the commiſſion would reach all manner of perſons whatſoever, as well unwilling, as willing, unbeleevers as beleevers, which none dare ſay. For if any Nation or City beleeveth not, no other Baptiſme belongeth to them, than to have duſt of the feet ſhaken off, for a teſtimony againſt them.

Againe, the Text readeth BAPTIZONTES AUTOUS *Matth.* 28. Baptizing them; that is not TA ETHNE the nations, but MATHETAS Diſciples which are included in the verbe MATHETEUSATE teach ye, or make diſciples: and ſo wee juſtifie that anſwer, which ſaith, that *the command of Chriſt*, extends its ſelfe onely to thoſe who being capeable, receive inſtruction, and are tought and made diſciples.

The Doctor ſeemes to take advantage from the word *made Diſciples*, and frameth us this Argument.

They that are made Diſciples may be baptized.

But, *Though Children in their nonage, cannot bee taught, yet they may be made Chriſts Diſciples, by being admitted into his Schoole their parents giving their names to Chriſt both for themſelves and their families.*

This is his ſaying, and if you will believe him you may, if not, I know uot, who can blame you: for here is no prooſe of it. VVhen as I had ſome Confe. rence with the *Doctor*. I did deſire prooſe from him, that children could in their nonage be made Diſciples, which he aſſayed thus to prove; and I did write it from his owne mouth, and read it in his preſence.

I did firſt alleadge that Children, could not bee made Diſcip'es. Becauſe it is written, *Whoſoever beareth not his Croſſe, and followeth mee cannot be my Diſciple, Luke* 14. 27.

His anſwer was, that this is meant of men and women, and not of Children: which I eaſily grant, and I doe bring it for the ſame purpoſe to prove, that children cannot be made Diſciples: which he aſſayed to prove thus.

All thoſe whoſe names are given to Chriſt, by their faithfull parents, and brought unto the Church, and received into the Church, and ſecurity given to be bred up in Chriſts ſchoole, are ſo farre made Diſciples, as is required of any, in their Infancy to be made Diſciples.

But, *Children have their Names given to Chriſt by their faithfull Parents, and are brought unto the Church, &c.*

Therefore, *They are ſo farre made Diſciples, as is required of any in their Infancy to be made Diſciples* with-

without any exception, against many things in this Argument, worthy of exception. I doe answer by granting the whole, namely that Children are so far *made Disciples*, as is required of any in their Infancy to be made Disciples, that is nothing at all; and so not to be Baptized at all. This is the period, and end of this weighty Argument.

But Mr. *Marshall* sets upon us with greater waight, to prove that Children may be made and called Disciples, from *Acts* 15.10. *Now therefore why tempt yee God, to put a yoak upon the necks of the Disciples.*

I reason thus, saith he, *page* 39.

All they upon whose necks those false Teachers would have put the yoak of Circumcision, are called Disciples and to be called Disciples.

But *they would have put the Circumcision, upon Infants as well as growne men.*

Therefore *Infants as well as growne men, are called Disciples, and to be called so.*

The *major* (saith he) is undenyable: the *minor* I prove thus, as you shall see at large, *Page* 39.

Good Sir, spare your labour of proving the *minor*, for that we doe grant as undenyable. But wee boldly deny the *major*, and cannot but be a little amazed, that you should have your sight so dimme, to thinke it undenyable.

You say, *that all they upon whose neck the yoak was to be put, were called Disciples.* This is but your saying, and we may not beleeve it: for the Text saith not so, which is alleadged. All that can be proved out of the Text is this, that they would have put a yoak *upon the necks of all the Disciples*, not that all were *Disciples* upon

whom they would have put the yoak: or that they would have put the yoke only upon the *Disciples*: I think this may be called perverting of Propositions, rather than converting; see but your error: All men living were once in *Noah's* Ark: All that were in *Noah's* Ark were men living.

The Blue Regiment was slaine in such a fight: All that were slaine in such a fight were of the blew Regiment. This is your arguing.

False Teachers put a yoak upon the neck of the *Disciples*: All were *Disciples*, that false Teachers put a yoak upon: which if it were so, not onely Children, (who were to bee Circumcised after the manner of *Moses*) must be called *Disciples*, but also Servants, of what age soever, whether beleevers, or unbeleevers, must be called *Disciples*: *For all Servants bought with money must needs be circumcised*, Gen. 17.13.

Let a stranger circumcise all the males that belong unto him. Exod. 12.14.

Servants are then to be called *Disciples* as well as *Children*. But more of this anon. If I had not found this under Master *Marshalls* name, I should never have given credit to any report of it. Sure it is, that if you deale thus with us often, we shall hardly believe you when you tell us the truth.

There is one thing more wee must take notice of in the Doctors reply, that in Christs precept, *Teaching* doth not goe before, but follow *Baptizing*, *Mat.* 28.20. *Teaching them to observe all things, &c.*

Answ. This indeed doth prove *Teaching* followes *Baptizing*; but it doth not prove that it did not goe before. I wonder we heare not of that *Mark* 1. 4.

John

Iohn did Baptize and Preach; which is alledged by ſome, but the anſwer is the ſame, that this proves no more but that hee preached after hee Baptized: not that he preached not before. And no man queſtions, but that as Preaching goes before Baptiſme, ſo alſo it ought to follow: Which Order is well laid down, *Heb.* 6. 1. what is to be preached before the adminiſtration of Baptiſme, viz. *Repentance from dead workes, and faith towards God the Doctrine of Baptiſmes.* And what is to be preached after, viz *laying on of hands, reſurrection from the dead, eternall judgement*; and ſo on to perfection

Other things there are worthy of exception in the Doctors Reply: but wee leave them to their proper place in the following Arguments. Thus have wee done with the firſt Argument, which comes forth like a forlorne hope: and what the event of it hath beene, I leave to thy cenſure. I will now goe forward, by the aſſiſtance of God, to grapple with the ſecond Argument, one horne being broken, ſo that it is dreadfull no longer.

Argument. 2.

None ought to exclude the children of the faithfull, out of the Kingdome of heaven.

But *by denying them Baptiſme, (as much as in us lyeth) we exclude them out of the Kingdome of Heaven: for as Chriſt affirmed to* Nicodemus, *and confirmed it with a double oath, or moſt vehement aſſeveration,* Amen, Amen, or verily verily, I ſay unto thee, except a man bee borne of water, and of the Spirit, hee cannot enter into the kingdome of heaven. Ergo, *Wee cannot deny them Baptiſme.*

Master *Marshall* is so wary, as not to make use of this Argument at all; unlesse hee seem to dip his finger into it in his first Vse of Application, *page* 52. where he hath these words. First it serves for just reproof of the Anabaptists, and all such as by their rash and bloudy sentence, condemne Infants as out of the state of grace.

And unlesse it be lawfull for us to alleadge the testimony of *Irenæus*, cited by Mr. *Marshall*, *page*. 4.

The words are cited in *Latin*. (I believe hee was ashamed to English them) they bear this sence, *Christ came to save all through himselfe, (I say all) that are borne againe through him into God, Infants, littleones, and Children.* And by the word *borne againe*, according to the *Glossers* Interpretation is meant *Baptized*. Where the *Glosser*, cited by Master *Marshall*, joynes with Doctor *Featly*, in the meaning of the word *borne againe*. But I may not strictly lay this unto Master *Marshalls* charge, because he himselfe hath disclaymed it.

In this Argument I have not any adversary beside the Doctor, though many have written of the same subject of Baptisme of late.

For answer unto this argument, I would we might understand what the Doctor meaneth by the words *Kingdome of Heaven*. Which word is sometimes taken for the visible Church on earth, as for the preaching of the Gospell, as *Matth.*13. If by *Kingdome of heaven* in the Argument this sence bee held forth; then we deny the *major*, and say that Children are to be excluded from the Kingdome of Heaven, as not being capable of membership in a visible Church, being

ing uncapable of hearing, with understanding, the sound of the Gospell.

Secondly, sometimes the word *Kingdome* is taken for the manifestation of God unto the soules of men, as Rom. 14. 17. *The Kingdome of God is righteousnesse, and peace, and joy in the holy Ghost.* And *the Kingdome of God is within you*, Luke 17.21.

In this second acception, children are also excluded the *Kingdome of heaven*, that is, uncapable of discerning either good or evill, and of receiving the manifestations and Apprehensions of GOD in the soule.

Thirdly, by *Kingdome of heaven*, may bee understood grace, mercy, and favour of God. And this is the sence in which we imagine the Doctor taketh the word *Kingdome*. And being taken in this sence, wee deny the minor proposition, and say that by denying them Baptisme, wee doe not at all exclude infants, from the Kingdome of Heaven: but wee say that Children are as free from sinne, as fully in the favour and grace of God before Baptisme, as after. This seemes a strange paradox, to the Doctor who hath not yet learned the art of forgetfulnesse, to bury his old lesson. *For as much* as this childe is regenerated and borne againe of Water, *&c.*

For to strengthen the assertion: it is alledged which is written *Iohn* 3. 5. *Except a man bee borne againe of Water and of the Spirit, hee cannot enter into the Kingdome of heaven.*

Answ. If wee understand the word *Kingdome*, in the third sence, for the grace, mercy, and favour of God, revealed in *Iesus Christ*. What will bee more strange

strange than the sence that is brought unto us, *viz.* That unlesse a man bee baptised, there is no entrance into grace, favour, mercy, no remission of sinnes, *&c.* Which how contrary unto sound Doctrine it is, will appeare: in that the Scripture which setteth our unto us, the qualifications of those that are to bee baptised, doth require faith. *Acts* 8.37. *If thou beleevest with all thy heart thou mayest.* Where it is plaine that faith (whose object is remission of sinnes in *Jesus Christ*) is required in persons to be baptised. Peradventure the Dr. will say this is meant of men of years of discretion, and not of children: If hee shall so say; I demand what reason hee had to finde fault with his adversary: that unto that place in the 3. of *John* 5. did answere in these words: The words of our Saviour concerne men in riper yeares, and not Children. This the Doctor cannot beare in another, yet he will now beare with it in himselfe, as hee did before unto that place before alleadged. *Luke* 14.27.

Secondly, suppose this be meant of men of yeares of discretion, it is the Doctors owne grant, that Christ prescribes the remedy to them, as well as men, *page* 44. *line* 1. But he doth not prescribe this as a remedy to men (who are required to believe remission of sins before Baptisme) therefore not unto children: unlesse it be more effectuall unto children then unto men. To speake my thoughts of this Argument, I shall discover the ground-worke upon which it is built. Namely, upon these Propositions.

First, *That Baptisme* was ordayned to take away the filth of sin.

Secondly, *That Children* before their Baptisme, are

are defiled with ſinne, as well, (he ſhould rather have ſaid, as ill) as men.

Thirdly, *That Children* after Baptiſme are waſhed from ſin.

This is the man that did pretend to write *Romes Ruine:* Yet ſee how hee dawbeth with *Romes Truall*, and with her untempered mortar. See I pray you, how he plougheth with *Romes Heifer.* I will challenge the Ieſuites, to produce me if they can, more foundation raſing errors, than theſe.

To the firſt, that Baptiſme doth not take away the filth of ſinne: That which takes away the filth of ſin, *juſtifies.*

But *Baptiſme* doth not *juſtifie.* Therefore it doth not take away the filth of ſin.

Againe, if the *bloud of Chriſt* have taken away all ſinne; then there remaineth none for *Baptiſme* to take away. If any remaine for *Baptiſme* to take away; then hath not the bloud of *Chriſt* taken away all ſinne.

Now that the bloud of Chriſt hath taken away all ſinne that ever ſhall be taken away, we have the Scriptures to witneſſe, *Iohn* 1. *Behold the Lambe of God that taketh away the ſinne of the world.* 1 *Pet.* 2.24. *who himſelfe tooke away our ſins, in his owne body upon the Tree. By whoſe ſtripes yee are healed.*

Now what is this but to deny *Chriſt* comming in the fleſh? to deny his propitiation, and attonement.

Now unto the ſecond Propoſition: That children before their Baptiſme are defiled with the guilt of ſinne.

Wee grant that they are ſo indeed by nature.

Which is the thing that the Doctor labours to prove, which we doe not deny. Hee should have proved, that they cannot be by any meanes justified by the grace of God from that Transgression, whereof they stand guilty by nature before *Baptisme*. Yet it is worth the observation, how like himselfe he is in his proofe, for he reasoneth thus, *page* 44. *All that are sentenced to death are guilty of sinne.* But children are sentenced to death, for they dye: therefore they are guilty of sinne.

Is it possible a *Doctor* should reason no better? What could he have done more against himselfe? He saith, *All that are sentenced to death are guilty of sinne.* Surely, then his sprinkled Infants are not yet cleansed, but the guilt of sinne remaineth on them: for many of them dye immediately after their sprinklings if not three quarters dead before.

This is against his third Proposition.

Againe, if all that are sentenced to death are guilty of sinne, then is not the Doctor yet purged from his *old* sinnes by his owne confession, the *Messengers of death*, having already summoned him to appeare Nay then did not the Apostle speak truth when hee said, *Rev.* 1. 5. *Who hath loved us, and washed us from our sinnes in his blood.* What shall we say? that the wise are taken in their owne craftinesse? That the Lord hath put out the right eye of the Prophets and Priests, and hath sent them strong delusions, that they should believe a lye.

But before I leave this Argument, I deem it necessary, to give you the meaning of the Text which is wrested by the Doctor. *Except a man be borne againe of water*

water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of heaven.

I did make bold to tell the Doctor to his face, that the *Protestants* doe not understand this Text of *Baptisme.* VVhich thing he confessed, and said that the Protestants, out of their zeale against the Papists, did goe too farre on the right hand in the meaning of the Text. Now how farre hee hath wandred on the left hand, let all be judge.

Cardinall *Bellarmin* confesseth, that the Protestants doe not make use of this Text, as not acknowledging a necessity of Baptisme unto salvation, which this Text seemeth to hold forth.

All the difficulty of the Text will bee resolved, when we shall rightly understand what it is to *be borne againe of water.* VVhich all men know to be a metaphoricall speech, and therefore we must consider the minde of the speaker. To be borne againe of water is to be partaker of the Invisible, and spirituall washing from sinne by Iesus Christ. *If I wash thee not, thou shalt have no part with me, Iohn* 13. 8. *Vnto him that loved us, and washed us from our sinnes in his bloud, Revelations* 1. 5.

These are they that come out of great Tribulations, and have washed their Robes in the bloud of the Lambe, Revel. 7. 14.

But it will be said, that this is a *bloud-washing*, not a *water-washing.*

I answer, That there are two things considerable in Scripture.

First, the *washing*, or taking away of sin.

Secondly, the *manifestation* of this washing unto

the conſcience. Both theſe, but eſpecially the latter, are ſet out in Scripture, under the metaphor of water, *Ezeck.* 36. 25. *I will ſprinkle cleane water upon you, and cleanſe you from*, &c. *Iohn* 4. 10. *Hee would have given thee living water, verſe* 14. *Whoſoever ſhall drinke of the water that I ſhall give him, ſhall never thirſt: but the water that I ſhall give him, ſhall bee in him, a well of water, ſpringing up into everlaſting life.* Now, what is this water ſave the word of promiſes, conveied unto the ſoule by the ſpirit. *Iohn* 6. 38. *Hee that beleeveth on me, out of his belly ſhall flow rivers of living water: This ſpake he of the ſpirit*: promiſe is water, and ſpirit is water. To bee borne of water is to bee borne of the Word. *Being borne againe, not of corruptible ſeede, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever*, 1. *Pet.* 1. 23. *To be borne of the ſpirit*; is to have the ſpirit miniſtred to the ſoule, by the hearing of faith. *Gal.* 3. 2 *Cor.* 3. whereby the ſoule is ſealed, to the day of Redemption. Thus much in briefe to declare the meaning of this place, to cleare it from the cloudy gloſſe, which the Papiſts in the firſt place, and the Doctor in the next, have put upon it. The ſence then of the text is no more but this: He that beleeveth not ſhall bee damned. Which the Doctor muſt grant onely to bee ſpoken of men of riper yeares, unleſſe hee will condemne all infants to deſtruction. Thus much for the ſecond argument, wherein the Doctor is ingaged alone. The third followes.

Argument 3. *page* 44.

Dr. Featly. *They whom the Apoſtles Baptized, are not to be excluded from Baptiſme: for what the Apoſtles did in their miniſteriall function, they undoubtedly did either by Chriſts command*

mand, or by the direction of the holy Spirit, wherewith they were infallibly aſsiſted.

But *the Apoſtles Baptized Children : for they Baptized whole families, whereof Children were a knowne part.*

Ergo, *Children ought not to bee excluded from Baptiſme.*

The Goſpell takes place, juſt as the Law, by bringing in whole families together : when Abraham *was taken in, his whole Family was taken in with him. When any of the Gentiles turned Proſelytes, ordinarily their families came in with them : ſo in this new Adminiſtration, uſually if the Maſter of the houſe turned Chriſtian, his whole family came in and are Baptized with him.* Mr. Marſhall Page 40.

Anſwer. I cannot but commend the modeſty of *Bellarmin*, who bringiug in this Argument, confeſſeth that it concludeth onely probably, and nothing certaine, becauſe no man is able to proove, that there were any Children in theſe families.

Yet theſe men muſt have it ganted them, otherwiſe they imagine we are not to be borne with all: for ſaith the Doctor, *It is no way credible, that in all theſe Families bleſſed by God, and converted to the Chriſtian faith, all the women ſhould be barren, and not one fruitfull.* For Anſwer I ſay. Firſt, the Doctor cannot prove, that there were any marryed women at all in theſe Families. Secondly, ſuppoſe them to be all marryed, muſt they needs be barren, unleſſe they had little children in the Cradle. Is it not poſſible that a man and woman may have ſeven Children, or more, and yet the leaſt of them be able to perceive the weaknes of the Doctors reaſoning, and able to confute it?

Concerning the ſix houſholds baptized, we find but two of them that had their whole houſholds Baptized: that is, *Cornelius* Acts 11. 14. and *the Gaoler*, *Acts* 16 33. Now concerning the firſt of theſe: it is ſaid *Acts* 10. 2. *That he feared God with all his houſe*: And we read of no more Baptized, ſave they that *received the holy Ghoſt*, verſe 47. *Can any man forbid water, that theſe ſhould be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we.* And wee read of no more receiving the Holy Ghoſt, ſave they which *heard the Word*, verſe 44. *The holy Ghoſt fell on all them which heard the Word.* Now all that were Baptized, feared God, heard the VVord, received the Holy Ghoſt as well as the Apoſtles themſelves. For the ſecond whole houſhold baptized, which was the *Gaolers*, *Acts* 16. we read, that they *ſpake the word to all that were in the houſe*, *verſe* 32. and *ſo his whole houſe believing in God rejoyced*, verſe 34. So that all that are here ſaid to be Baptized, are ſaid to heare the VVord, believe and rejoyce. Now how any ſuch ſhould be a child in a Cradle, not able to diſcerne good or evill, we are (as yet) not able to underſtand.

As for the other foure houſhoolds, it is not ſayd, that the whole houſholds were Baptized, and therefore no need that the Sucklings ſhould be excepted, if there had beene any. Firſt, becauſe there was not as yet ſuch a Doctor hatcht, who would imagine Infants to be baptized. Secondly, the name of the whole being commonly taken for the greater part, ſometimes for the better part; as alſo ſometimes for the worſe part. Thirdly, the Doctor cannot imagine why the *Apoſtle* ſhould not except Children if they were not Baptized

tized. I will intreat him to give *mee* leave to imagine the reaſon: and it ſhall be none other than the anſwer of the Lord to the Diſciples, *Matth* 13.13. *Therefore ſpeak I to them in Parables: Becauſe they ſeeing ſee not, and hearing, heare not, &c.* They that are *wiſe* ſhall underſtand, but the *heart of this people is waxed groſſe, and their eares are dull of hearing.* The Doctor might as well have asked the queſtion, if it were not the mind of Chriſt, that Children ſhould be Baptized, why did he not in expreſſe termes ſay, Children ſhall not bee Baptized, that ſo in a word the Controverſie might have been ended. I leave the Anſwer of this queſtion unto the prudent that are truely taught of God. As for others, they are not able to beare it.

I muſt now turne me unto Maſter *Marſhall*, who tells us a very faire ſtory, if it were true, that the Goſpell took place juſt as the Law, ſo that uſually, if the Maſter of the family turned Chriſtian, his whole family came in, &c.

Sure wee read of ſixe families, and no more, and that ſometimes it is ſo, none can deny: we bleſſe God we are able to ſhew the truth of it in our dayes, though rarely. But that this was, or is an uſuall thing, is not true. Was not *Philemon* a Chriſtian, and yet his ſervant *Oneſimus* an unbeleever? Nay was it not an ordinary caſe among the *Corinths*, and elſe where, that the husband was a beleever, and the wife an unbeleever? 1 *Cor.* 7.14. *The unbeleeving wife is ſanctified by the husband*: And *how knoweſt thou O man whether thou ſhalt ſave thy wife? verſe* 16. Nay, was it not an uſuall caſe, that the Father was a beleever, but the Children unbeleevers? the Children beleevers, but the Father

an

an unbeleever? otherwiſe what meane theſe words, *Matth.* 10. 21. *The brother ſhall deliver up the brother, and the father the child: and children ſhall riſe up againſt their parents, &c. verſe* 35. *I am come to ſet a man at variance againſt his Father, and the daughter againſt her mother: and the daughter in law againſt the mother in law, and a mans foes ſhall bee they of his owne houſhold, Mark* 13. 12. *Children ſhall riſe up againſt their parents, and cauſe them to be put to death.* All this notwithſtanding he is bold to affirme, that it was an uſuall thing as of old, when the Maſter was Circumciſed, all the family was circumciſed. For when the Maſter or father of the Family was Baptized, all the whole family followed. I wonder men of learning, and gravity are not aſhamed of ſuch arguing as this. This Argument ſeemes ſo light unto me, and lyeth open unto many abſurdities, more then I either have, or will ſpeak of: that ſurely in my judgement, it is not worthy of a further anſwer.

But men that have no better weapons, muſt be contented to bring forth ſuch as they have. I will now haſten unto the fourth Argument: In theſe words, Page 45.

Dr. Featly. *Such as were Circumciſed under the Law may and ought to be Baptized under the Goſpell: for Baptiſme anſwereth to Circumciſion, and is called by that name,* Col. 2 11, 12. *The ſame grace is ſealed unto us by the one, as by the other, to wit; mortification of the fleſh, remiſſion of ſinnes, and admiſſion into the viſible Church. And the children of Chriſtians are as capable of Baptiſme, as the children of the Iewes were of Circumciſion.* But *children were Circumciſed under the Law,* Gen. 17. 12. 13.

Ergo,

Ergo. *Children may and ought to bee baptized under the Goſpel.*

The ſame command which injoyned Abraham, to ſeale his children with the ſeale of the Covenant, injoynes us as ſtrongly to ſeale ours with the ſeale of the covenant, And that command of God which expreſly bound Abraham, to ſeale his with the ſigne of circumciſion, which was the ſacrament then in force pro tempore, *doth virtually bind us, to ſeale ours with the ſeale* of *Baptiſme; which is the Sacrament now in force, and ſucceeds in the roome of the other by his owne appoyntment.*

Page 27. *Be pleaſed to obſerve how plaine the Apoſtle makes it, that Baptiſme ſucceeds in the roome, place and uſe,* of *circumciſion,* Col. 2. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

Here is very much ſpoken, and little proved, many intricate queſtions being herein involved, which would aske much labour to diſcuſſe.

Firſt, Whether Baptiſme come in the roome of circumciſion? the proofe alledged out of *Col.* 2. 8. doth prove Baptiſme, to ſucceed in the roome of circumciſion, no more than, 1 *Pet.* 3. 20. 21. doth prove Biptiſme to come in the place of the Arke of *Noah* which indeed Maſter *Marſhall* will ſay: for he ſaith Baptiſme is the Arke to carry to heaven. page 58. 11.

Secondly, Whether the ſame grace were ſealed in Circumciſion, which is ſealed in Baptiſme, neither more nor leſſe, as firſt, whether ſomthing were not ſealed in Circumciſion, which is no ſealed in baptiſme; *viz.* I will give unto thee, and to thy ſeede after thee, the Land wherein thou art a ſtranger; All the land of Canaan for an everlaſting poſſeſſion. *Gen.* 17 8. ſecondly, another querie is; whether ſomething bee

not ſealed in Baptiſme, which was not ſealed to the Iewes in Circumciſion? *viz. Sinne already taken away, and tranſgreſſion finiſhed* 1600. *yeares agon, by the Meſſiah.*

Thirdly, a third queſtion, whether the Scripture, will give us warrant, to call BAPTIZME a ſeale or not.

Thus you ſee that which theſe men thinke ſo plaine, doth indeed fill the world, with doubtfull controverſies; But I ſhall ſhunne all theſe queſtions, and addreſſe my ſelfe unto the anſwer of the argument: In which I deny the major, and ſay that they which were *uncircumciſed* under the Law, may not bee *Baptized* under the Goſpel; neither doth the command of God, which bound the Iew to *circumciſion*, bind us to *baptiſme*. This remaineth to be proved: for firſt of all.

The command of God, commanded all Males to bee *circumciſed*, whether the Parents beleeved or not. And this is more than any of both theſe, undertakers dare affirme, that all Children ſhould be baptiſed.

Secondly, the command of God required the many thouſands of Iſrael to bee circumciſed, at the hill of foreskins, when they were growne men, and bare Armes, yet we read of no profeſſion of faith, *Ioſ.* 5. 3. It was enough to entitle any one unto circumciſion, that he was of the loynes of *Abraham*. But this was not enough to entitle men to baptiſme. Which the *Baptiſt* ſeemes to mee, to confirme, when hee reproves the Phariſees, *Mat.* 3. 9. *And thinke to ſay within your ſelves, we have Abraham to our Father*: as if hee ſhould have ſaid; you thinke to clayme, right and privilege unto Circumciſion, for you, and yours; be-

cauſe

cauſe *Abraham* is your Fa her : and indeed ſo you may. And now becauſe you have right to circumciſion, you imagine alſo, tha upon the ſame ground, you have right to baptiſme; I tell you nay: for this baptiſme, is the baptiſme of repentance: *Bring forth therefore fruits, meete for repentance.* You have hither o lived under a Nationall Church, under carnall ordinances, wherein the chaffe, and the Wheate, have been mingled together, without ſeparation, and have ſeemed to injoy, the ſame priviledges, and prerogatives under the carnall commandement. But now commeth one, *whoſe fanne is in his hand, and hee will throughly purge His Floure, and gather the Wheate into his Garner, but the* Chaffe *will Hee burne with unquenchable fire.*

Hitherto wee have injoyed common priviledges. You have all been Circumciſed, all eaten the Paſſeover, all brought your offerings to the Prieſts, without any diſtinction of chaffe from Wheat. But it ſhall not be ſo now: So that we ſee there is more qualifications required unto Baptiſme, than were required unto Circumciſion.

Thirdly, the command of God, required not only Children, to be circumciſed, but alſo ſervants, as hath been ſpoken before, *Gen.* 17. And when a *Proſelite* came in, he was bound not onely to circumciſe his *Children*, but all his *Servants*, *Exod.* 12. 48. So that if the command be in force for Children; it muſt needs be alſo in force for ſervants. So that if a Maſter bee converted to the faith, and have an hundred Servants, they muſt all bee Baptized whether they will or no. Now who will not bluſh at this? let them ſee how they can eſcape this.

We muſt not let paſſe the dealing of theſe men, who will have the command to ſtretch, either wider, or narrower, (like the Sea mans hoſe) according to their pleaſure. Sometimes they will not be tyed to the command, as in the circumſtance of time; and yet they are not able to ſhew any reaſon why the circumſtance ſhould not tye them. And I would they would reſolve us one queſtion; how many dayes a child may be kept unbaptized without ſin?

Sometimes they will ſtretch beyond their command, as in Baptizing Females. They will challenge as great a priviledge as may be, either to doe, or not to doe at their pleaſure.

And yet is the Argument of *Circumciſion* the maine poſt and pillar upon which the whole Fabrick leaneth.

Fourthly, if the command of *Circumciſion* be the rule of Baptiſme, why ſhould not the Paſſeover, be the rule of the Supper.

As among the Ancients, who did give the Lords Supper unto Children upon the ſame ground. And he hath no other ſhift to avoyd it, but by denyall that Infants did eat the paſſover. There is no ſuch thing mentioned (ſaith he) in the Book of God.

But for that, we ſay, firſt the *whole Familie was to eate it*, Exod. 12. And Maſter *Marſhall* thinks it a ſufficient ground, that children were Baptized, becauſe ſome Families were Baptized And ſhall it not be a ſufficient ground, that Children eate the Paſſeover, when not a few, but all the Families of *Iſrael*, even the whole *Aſſembly of the Congregation did eat it*.

Vnto this Maſter *Marſhall* replyeth *page* 40. that our Argu-

Argument is not ſo ſtrong as theirs; to prove Infants did eate the Paſſeover.

They reaſon thus, *Some Families were Baptized.*

Therefore *Children were Baptized.*

We reaſon thus; *Not ſome onely, but all the families of Iſrael did eate the Paſſeover.* Therefore *Children did eate the Paſſeover.*

The firſt of theſe reaſons, (as they thinke) is ſtrong for them: Then why ſhould not the ſecond bee ſtronger againſt them? No, they deny the conſequence; Strange what conceit will doe. But leaſt hee ſhould ſpeak without reaſon, he will tell yon why he denyeth the Conſequence. Becauſe no other Scripture ſhewes that the Paſſeover doth belong to Infants. But wee have other plaine Scriptures, that Baptiſme is in the roome of Circumciſion *page* 41. Firſt, the weakneſſe of the reaſon is here plainly confeſt. Secondly, theſe Scriptures are not yet ſeeen. Thirdly, if you could bring but ſuch Scripture for Baptizing of Infants, as we are able to bring for Infants eating the Paſſeover, the controverſie would ſoon be ended.

Firſt, all the Congregation of Iſrael did eat thereof. But by your confeſſion Infants of nine dayes old, were admitted into the viſible Church, and ſo admitted members of the Congregation.

Secondly, there was no barre (bodily uncleanneſſe excepted) to keep any from the Paſſeover, but uncircumciſion onely. *No uncircumciſed perſon ſhall eate thereof, Exod.* 12.48.

Thirdly it was the command of God: *Three times of the yeare ſhall all the males appear before the Lord,* Exod. 23.17. *Thrice in the yeare ſhall all your men children ap-*

peare before the Lord, *Exod.* 34. 23. That the Feaſt of the *Paſſeover* was once of this thrice, appeareth as by the fore-cited places. So alſo *Deut.* 16. 1. unto the end of the eighth verſe, as alſo is manifeſt by example, *Luke* 2. 41. *His parents went to Ieruſalem every year at the feaſt of the Paſſeover.* I am certaine that if our oppoſites had but thus much for the Baptiſme of Infants, that wee have for Infants eating the Paſſeover, they would clap their hands and cry *vicimus*. Let them ſee in the meane time, the ſtrength, or rather weaknes of their owne great Argument, which indeed produceth all the reſt. For I will bee bold to ſay, that take this Argument of Circumciſion away, and you ſhall take all away.

But ſuppoſe we ſhould grant, if Baptiſme came in the roome of Circumciſion, that the ſame, and no other grace is ſealed in the one, than in the other. Yet will it not follow that *Children* ſhould bee Baptized, becauſe there being a change of of the Ordinance and a vaniſhing of it away, we are not to looke back unto the old, that is vaniſhed away, but unto the command which inſtituteth the new: It is the command by which we muſt be guided, leſt he that is the Iudge of all ſay unto us, as unto the *ſuperſtitious Scribes and Phariſees: In vaine doe they worſhip me, teaching for Doctrine the tradition of men*, *Matth.* 15. 6. And *who hath required theſe things at your hands?* But unto this they reply, That we have no command for giving the Supper to *Women*, or for Baptizing of *Women*, as ſome have ſaid, (whom for honour ſake I will not name) that we have no example for Baptizing of *Women*: ſo farre had they forgotten themſelves, and erred, not knowing the

Scrip-

Scriptures. Doctor *Featlies* words are theſe, *They can can produce no expreſſe particular command either for the Baptizing of women, or adminiſtring the Lords Supper to them*, page 46.

Maſter *Marſhall* is a little bolder in the one Ordinance than in the other. His words are theſe page 35. *In the poynt of Sacraments there is no expreſſe command, no example in all the new Teſtament, where women received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. There is no expreſſe command, that the Children of beleevers, when they are growne ſhould be inſtructed, and baptized; though inſtructed by their parents.*

What would theſe men have? would they impoſe upon us, that ſo nething may bee added unto the worſhip of God, which is not at all found in Scripture by *command*, or *example*? They dare not ſay ſo: How often ſhall we tell them, that if they bring us either *command*, or *example*, by neceſſary conſequence, we wil beleeve them.

Firſt, *No command for Baptixiug of women*, ſaith the Doctor. But. Maſter *Marſhall* dare not ſay ſo. I pray what is that *Matth.* 28. 20. *Make Diſciples of all nations, baptizing them.* Here is a *command for baptizing beleeving Diſciples.*

Secondly, we have no *command*, ſaith the Doctor, no *example*, ſaith Maſter *Marſhall, that women received the Lords Supper.* This was alledged againſt Maſter *Latimer*, in Queen *Maries* dayes at the diſputation holden at *Oxford* by the popiſh crew. And it was then to their ſhame anſwered by the *Martyr*, That wee had a command in the 1 Cor. 11.28. *Let a man examine himſelfe.* The Word in the Greek is ANTHROOPOS, And in their

their owne vulgar Latin *Homo*, which signifies a man or woman. This answer of his did so abash the Popish fry, that they had not wherewith to reply. But these men are not so easily dasht out of countenance, they cannot so easily blush. But in their conceit they are able to shift this. They confesse that the word signifies man, or woman: yet they say, though the word ANTHROOPOS is common name to both Sexes. Yet the Apostle useth the masculine Article, HO, not HE, and HEAUTON, not HEAUTEN, and so there is no expresse command, but for men. I wonder the Doctors face is not as red as his Scarlet Gowne, in bringing such a *Criticisme*, in a matter of so great weight. You cannot be ignorant, that under the more worthy gender, both Sexes are usually comprehended. The Church in *Acts* 1. 15. are termed *Disciples*, in the masculine gender: and yet were *women* amongst them, *verse* 14. The *Apostles*, write to *Saints*, *Brethren*, *Beloved*, all in the masculine gender. Therefore did he not write to any women. Thus the Doctor reasons, 1 *Iohn* 5. 21. The *Apostle* saith, *Little Children keep your selves from Idolls*. *Your selves*, in the Greek is masculine: though Childre be *neuter*. Now by the Doctors Logick, *Women are not here commanded to keep from Idolls*, *Heb.* 9. 27. *It is appoynted for men once to dye*. The word men is restrained to the Masculine, by the Article TOIS: Therefore this is not meant of women: it cannot be proved from hence, that women must dye. *Doctor-like*. How long will you harden your faces. Are you not yet ashamed of these *things*, (my pen had almost written) *tricks*, *Psalme* 39. 6. *Surely every man walketh in a vaine shew*:

Dr. Featly. page 73.

shew. The heart of man is deceitfull, Rom. 3. 10. *There is none righteous, no not one*, Gal. 3. 10. *Cursed is every one that continueth not, &c.* All these and a thousand more in the Masculine gender: Doe these places exclude women? The Doctor complaines, they have taken way his Bookes, and Livings. Surely, he that readeth this, will suppose he hath lost his reason, and his understanding also. To make an end of this Brabble, I prey consider, *Gen.* 5. 2. *Male and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name* Adam.

A third Proposition is layd downe by Master *Marshall, page* 45. That there is no expresse command, that the children of Beleevers when they are growne, should be instructed, and Baptized, &c. I should as soone have beleeved, that the Rivers would have forgotten their course, and runne up the hills, as that such a thing should have flowne from Master *Marshalls* mouth. Thus are men smitten with blindnesse, and their *right eye* put out; when they fight against the truth of God. *O Lord, thou art righteous in thy judgements: thou hast confounded the wise, and made their folly to appeare: Thou hast given them strong delusions, that they should beleeve a lye, because they have not beleeved thy Truth: Oh our Father, out of the mouth of Babes hast thou perfected prayse: When the wise doe utter folly and deceit.*

I shall bring no other thing against Master *Marshall*, but his owne words: Out of his owne mouth shall he be judged His next words are these: *Expresse command there is, that they should teach the Heathen and the Iewes, and make them Disciples, and then Baptize them. But no command, that the Children of Beleevers should be*

taught and baptized, &c. Why, are the Children of *Beleevers*, neither *Iewes* nor *Gentiles*. They muſt bee of one ſort. For theſe two divide the whole world in Scripture; into *Iew*, or *Gentile*: the *Gentile* again being divided into *Greek* or *Barbarian*, *Heathen*, and *Gentile* being but one in ſignification. The grown Children of Beleevers, are eyther *Iewes* or *Gentiles*, or elſe none of the world. But there is a command to Baptize all Diſcipled *Iewes* and *Gentiles*. Therefore all grown children of Beleevers ſo ſoone as they ſhall be Diſcipled.

In the next place, to prove, that *they who were Circumciſed may be Baptized*, is brought the reaſon and equity of the Law, which ſtill remaineth.

I pray what reaſon can be ſhewed why the people ſhould be Circumciſed at all: but *only the will and command of God*?

Againe, what reaſon can be ſhewed, why children ſhould be Circumciſed, from *Abraham to Chriſt*; rather then from *Adam to Abraham*. Here reaſon falters, ſa th and obedience takes place.

Yee are my friends, if yee doe whatſoever I command you. Iohn 15. 14.

Againe, they ſay, *If the Children of Chriſtian parents ſhould be excluded from Baptiſme, they were in a worſe condition than the Iewes under the Law.*

I anſwer, it followeth not, that happineſſe which they had by Circumciſion under the Law was called a *Yoak*, Acts 15. And Maſter *Marſhall* confeſſeth, that it did oblige them to great expences, and long journeys. Yet if it ſhould have beene a greater Prerogative than it was, the conſequence will not hold:

for

for who dare ſay, that the Children and Infants of *Seth* were in a worſe condition (in reſpect of ſalvation) than the children of *Abraham*: and yet they were neither Circumciſed, nor Baptized, and yet ſaved as well as they, that were both *Circumciſed* and *Baptized*. I will not dwell any longer upon the Anſwer of this fourth Argument, but goe on to conſider the fifth.

Argument 5.

They who are comprized within the Covenant, and are nowhere prohibited to receive the Seale thereof, may, and ought to receive it. Dr. Peatly. Page 46.

But *Children are comprized within the Covenant of faith, whereof Circumciſion was a ſeale*, Rom. 8. 11. *And now Baptiſme is.*

Ergo, *Children may and ought to receive Baptiſme.*

This is Maſter *Marſhalls* firſt and great Argument, which he layeth downe in Rime, thus.

The Infants of Beleeving parents, are fœderati, *therefore they muſt be* ſignati: *They are within the Covenant of grace, belonging to Chriſts body, Kingdome, and Family: therefore are to partake of the Seale of his Covenant, or the diſtinguiſhing badge, between them who are under the Covenant of grace, and them who are not.* Mr. Marſhal. page 8.

Anſwer. Theſe two Arguments do but onely differ in word: but in ſubſtance they are one and the ſame. Both of equall force, or rather of like weakeneſſe. I ſhall addreſſe my ſelfe to anſwer the Argument, as it is layd downe by Maſter *Marſhall*, becauſe in him it hath the greater weight. Onely I ſhall touch the Doctor by the way: and firſt I muſt obſerve the Doctors ſleight, in leaving out ſome words which

ought to have beene inserted in the second Proposition, *viz.* *Children are comprized within the Covenant of Faith.* These words ought to have beene added *And are nowhere prohibited to receive the seale thereof.* And then the *minor* Proposition shall be denyed: *Because an Institution of God, and an affirmative command, doth usually forbid all things that are comprehended in the affirmative command, or which are beyond, or besides the Institution.* Is it any where in Scripture forbidden, that the Doctor shall not Baptize his Bells, from the Popish superstition? But if he should doe so, might it not be said, *Who hath required these things at your hands?* and might not the Lord justly challenge you with the breach of his command? *Adde not thou unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a lyar, Prov.* 30. 6. Thus will the Lord say; I gave Commission to *Baptize Beleevers*, and yee have *Baptized Children. In vaine doe yee worship me.* To adde unto the Ordinance of God, hath seemed a slender fault sometimes. But surely in my conceit, nothing can be more hideous, I confesse it a foule fault to take any thing away, but a farre greater to adde. See *Rev.* 22. 18, 19. *If any man shall take away from the words of the Prophesie of this Book, God shall take away his part of the Book of life, &c.* A heavier censure: But, *if any man shall adde, God shall adde unto him all the plagues that are written in this book.* A heavy censure: Therefore let this *D.* heare, and tremble, thou hast transgressed his Commission, thou hast added to his words, *Repent therefore of this wickednesse, that if it be possible the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee.* When a man commeth to a *vessell of wine*, and taketh away many Gallons, yet that which

which remaine h is *Wine* ſtill. But if he ſhall adde but one G llon of wa er, but a *dram* or two of p yſon, the *Wine* remaineth no longer *Wine*. B t *your Wine is mixt with water, Iſa* 1. 22 and there will be death found in a *poyſoned Cup*. Take a homely co pa iſon along with you. A Butcher hath two C uſtomers i the Summer time, the *Waſpe*, and the *Fleſh fly*: the *waſpe* brings nothing with him, but takes ſome meat away. The *flye* tak s nothing away, but addeth unto that ſhe fin is: Now tell mee, if the Butcher had not rather have ſeven *waſpes* in his ſhop than one *Flye*. Per. dventure the *Doctor* may plead, he is no *waſpe*, (yet we feele his ſting) yet in this he ſhall never juſtifie himſ. lfe from being a *buzzing fleſh flye*; that h th done more harme by *addition*, than ever he could have done by *ſubſtracti-on*. I leave the Doctor to prove unto us the Propoſition denyed. And I adder ſſe my ſelfe unto Maſter *Marſhalls* great Argument, in ſhew like a *weavers beame*: But when I have weighed it, I finde it ſo light, that it is like the *Chaffe before the wind*, or like the Thiſtle Downe before the *whirle winde*. Both of the Propoſitions bein ſo f. lſe, that it appeares the concluſion hath not any ſhew of truth Fi ſt, they that are in Covenant muſt bee ſealed. This is denyed: For firſt, *women* a ong the *Iewes* were in Covenant, yet not ſealed with *Circumciſion*: His Reply is, that they were Circumciſed in the Males. Very good, if Circumciſion be a rule of *Baptiſme*, let him ſhew us a reaſon, *why female Children, ſhould not be baptized in the males*. But we adde, *male children* among the *Iewes* were in Covenant before they were eight dayes old, yet were they not Circumciſed before they were eight

eight dayes old: becauſe God had ſet the eight day, an expreſſe terme for *Circumciſion.* And ſo hath God ſet an expreſſe time for Baptiſme: viz. *The time of beleeving.*

Thirdly, we farther adde upon Maſter *Marſhalls* owne grant, in his firſt concluſion, That *the Covenant of grace hath alwayes for ſubſtance beene one and the ſame.* (In the proſecution whereof many things are confuſedly ſpoken) if this bee granted: Then were the Children of the faithfull, from *Adam* to *Noah*, *ten generations*; *from Noah* to *Abraham ten generations, as well in Covenant, as the Children of the faithfull now.* Or elſe the Covenant was not one and the ſame. But we ſee for twenty generations, no Seale annexed unto Children in Covenant. And the reaſon is becauſe God had not commanded. And this is the reaſon now, why Baptiſme is not to bee applyed unto Children, becauſe God hath not commanded it ſo to be applyed.

Fourthly, we further adde, upon the grant of the third Concluſion: That *ever ſince* Abrahams *time, God had a ſeale to be applyed to ſuch as enter into Covenant with him.* This gives us to take into conſideration, how Children of Beleevers are in Covenant more than the Children of unbeleevers? We ſay, that it is one thing *for God to enter into Covenant with the Creature*, it is another thing for the *Creature to enter into Covenant with God.* For we read of a Covenant *made by God unto everie living Creature, to fowle, Cattell, and everie beaſt of the earth. Gen.* 9. 10 Here we ſee *God enters into covenant with Beaſts and Fowls* But *they doe not reciprocally enter into covenant with God againe.* So that it

it is plaine, that God entring into Covenant with the Creature, and the creature entring into Covenant with God, are two reall diſtinct things. Although it be granted him, that God hath *entred into covenant with all beleevers children*, yet it ſhall never bee granted him, *that they have entred into covenant with God.* Wee grant that Concluſion, that God hath a Seale, now to be applyed to all that enter into Covenant with God. But this is the thing that ſhould have beene proved, that *children doe enter into covenant with God.* And yet all that he labours to prove is, that God entreth into Covenant with Children. God hath a Seale for all that Covenant with him, but not for all with whom he enters into Covenant.

The next thing to be taken into conſideration is, whether the Covenant of Gods grace, belong any more *to the children of beleevers, than unbeleevers?* and *whether it doe truely belong to all the children of unbeleevers*: or *whether to ſome of one, and ſome of the other indifferently?* If it belong to ſome of one, and ſome of the other indifferently: why doe they refuſe to Baptize the one when they Baptize the other. I could have wiſhed, that hee had declared unto us what hee had meant by the Covenant of grace, that hee might have ſpared our labour. For he confeſſeth, that only true beleevers are made partakers of the ſpirituall part of the Covenant, *page* 3. The *grace of God* is comprehended (ſo far as we are able to comprehend) in theſe branches: the *grace of Election*, of *Vocation*, of *Juſtification*, of *glorification.* I know not any other *fruit* of that *love of God*, revealed in the *new covenant*, manifeſted unto the world by *Ieſus*, the mediator between God & man.

Did

Did God give His Sonne *Iesus* to dye for the Children of Beleevers, and did he not give him to dye for the children of unbeleevers also? Otherwise how could the Gentiles have been taken into *covenant*. Hath God chosen all the children of Beleevers? Why, *then all of them shall be saved, for whom he did predestinate, them also hee called, Rom.* 8. Hath God chosen onely the children of beleevers; Then, *shall none other be saved.* But if he have chosen some of one, and some of the other: Then doth the grace of *Election* belong to one as well as to another. The like may be sayd of *Vocation*, and *Iustification*: wee cannot see how the children of beleevers should bee rather justified than the children of unbeleevers. For, *by the obedience of one, the free guift came upon all men, unto justification of life. Rom.* 5. 18. neither doe we understand the part of the *covenant* of grace, which is not spirituall.

But it will bee sayd, although our reason cannot fathom this, yet, if so bee that the text alleadged still hold forth, what he hath affirmed, we are bound to beleeve it. True, Therefore in the next place, we desire to ponder the Scripture which hee hath brought as a prop unto his opinion. *Acts* 2. 38, 39 *For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* In a word, by this promise, I understand the *knowledge of remission of sinnes, and life everlasting.*

Now who are the children that this promise is made unto. The Doctor will helpe us here a little (though against his will) for he confesseth that *the promise to Abraham, and his seede, was not to bee understood of the seede according to the flesh*: This hee saith is contrary

trary unto the Apoſtle, Rom. 4. 13. *The promiſe that he ſhould bee the heire of the world, was not given to Abraham, or his ſeed through the Law, but through the righteouſneſſe of faith, as hee was the father of all the faithfull*; and to this purpoſe alſo, this preſent text, *Acts* 2. 38. is alledged, unto which he joyneth, *Gals.* 3. 7. *Know yee therefore that they that are of faith, are the children of Abraham*: unto which alſo a reaſon is joyned, and yet applyed againſt reaſon, by the Doctor, page 47. From this conceſſion of the Doctors, wee give an anſwer unto the other: thus; No beleever hath a larger copy, or priviledge than *Abraham* had, but *Abrahams* copy (in reſpect of the eternall covenant) did not belong to *Abrahams* ſeed after the fleſh. Therefore the priviledges of beleevers doe not belong to their ſeed after the fleſh, but after the ſpirit. if it be inquired who are the ſeede of beleevers; it will be anſwered in the words of our Saviour, when it was told him, Mar. 3. 32. *Behold thy Mother and thy brethren, without ſeeke thee, and hee anſwered them ſaying, who is my Mother and my brethren. And hee looked round about on them, which ſate about him and ſayd, behold my Mother and my brethren*, &c. It is ſayd of *Levi*, that *hee ſayd unto his Father, and to his mother, I have not ſeene him, neither did hee acknowledge his brethren, nor know his owne children.* Hee that beleeveth and is baptized, the ſame is my Father, my Mother, my Brethren, my Siſters.

Thus we ſee that the ſeede of beleevers, is not to bee reckoned according to the fleſh.

But wee will grant, that that place in *Acts* 2. 38 is meant of that ſeede which was according to the fleſh: And wee ſay, that the promiſe is extended no farther

than the words of the Text, even *to as many, as the Lord your God shall call.* For first, the promise is made to you, *upon calling, to them that are a farre off* upon calling: and therefore *unto their Children also*, upon Calling; and no otherwise. The Text is plaine.

But Master *Marshall* replyeth, that this had been no comfort to tell them, that their Children should be received in, if they did believe, for this was no better comfort, than might have been preached to any *unbeleevers.* I playnly see that *Bernard* seeth not all things; and that Mr. *Marshall* misseth the scope of the Text, which I will endeavour to open, and then leave him to further consideration. When *Peter* had declared unto the *Iewes, that they had taken, and by wicked hands crucified and slaine the Lord of life,* Acts 2. 23. And that *God raised up, and made the same Iesus whom they crucified both Lord and Christ, verse* 36. When they were convinced in their soules of this wickednesse; they were *pricked in their hearts*, and doe not say, *what shall we doe to be saved?* But as men in a most forlorne, and desperate condition, out of all hope of salvation, either for their selves or their posterity they say, *Men and brethren what shall we doe?*

Let me lay open the heart of this people a little, that you may know and judge of their case. I suppose them thus to speak: Hath the Lord said indeed, *That every transgression, and disobedience against that Law, delivered unto us at* Sinay, *in the hand of a Mediator, shall receive a just recompence of reward?* Then what tongue can expresse, what heart can conceive that recompence that is due unto us? who have not onely

onely tranſgreſſed *Moſes* Law, but have alſo crucified the *Lord of life*, ſlaine the *Mediator of the new Teſtament*, wom *God* hath raiſed up, and made *Lord* of all. With what face can we looke on him, whom we have pierced? Tremble O earth, and be aſtoniſhed O heavens at our eſtate, and condition: Hills fall upon us, Mountaines cover us, what ſhall we doe? This is our miſery, and yet is not this all; for wee well remember what was written from the Trumpet of *Sinai*; *I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, viſiting the iniquity of the Fathers upon the Children, unto the third or fourth generation, of them that hate mee, Exodus* 20. 5. Will God indeed viſit the tranſgreſſion of his Law from *Sinai*, unto the third and fourth generation? ſure then, O curſed children of moſt curſed Parents, ſhall not we, and our Childrens children, be viſited unto a thouſand generations. O ſee, there is not any hope left, that either wee, or our children, or childrens children, ſhould ever be received unto mercy againe. We have crucified, we have ſlaine the *Lord of life*, and now, *men and brethren what ſhall we doe?* Now theſe things being thus, you ſhall ſee the playſter of *Conſolation*, full as broad as the ſoare of *Deſperation*. *Peter* ſpeaketh words of comfort unto them, to this effect: if you, your children, or generations a farre off, ſhall repent, and be Baptized, feare it not, you ſhall not be excluded, for I declare unto you the *promiſe to you, and to your children, and to all that are a farre off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.* Now let the Reader judge, whether the promiſe of taking in of their Children, upon Calling, were not a word of great Conſolation, unto deſperate, and diſtracted parents

rents, who for the preſent could think no other thing, but that both they and their children ſhould be for ever damned.

Thus much for the Expoſition of this Text, and for the anſwer unto the fift Argument.

Now followes the ſixt Argument, laid downe by Dr *Featly*, *page* 47.

Such who were typically Baptized under the Law, are capeable of reall and true Baptiſme, under the Goſpell: for the Argument holds good, a typo ad veritatem, *from the type to the truth, from the ſigne in the Law, to the thing ſignified in the Goſpel.*

But *Children were typically Baptized under the Law, for they with their Fathers, were under the cloud, and paſſed through the red ſea. But their waſhing with raine from the Cloud, prefigured our waſhing in Baptiſme, and by the Spirit. And the red Sea, in which* Pharaoh *and his Hoſt were drowned, was an embleme of Chriſts bloud, in which all our ghoſtly enemies are drowned, and deſtroyed.*

Ergo, *Children are capeable of true and reall Baptiſme under the Goſpell.*

In this Argument Maſter *Marſhall* joyneth not with him at all.

Anſw. It is unſufferable, when men will ſeek to prove a Concluſion true by two falſe Propoſitions.

Firſt, the *major* is denyed: *All that were typically Baptized under the Law, are not capable of true baptiſme under the Goſpell.* For by the ſame reaſon, all the whole Congregation of *Iſrael*, had beene capeable of Baptiſme in *Iohn Baptiſts dayes.*

Secondly, not only the Congregation of Iſrael, but a mixed

mixed multitude went up with them, *Exodus* 12. 38.

But he reasoneth, that this was a Type of our Baptisme.

I answer, *In every type as there is a similitude, so also there is some dissimilitude.*

Secondly, I deny that this was any type of Baptisme at all: and the Dr. cannot prove it.

Now to the *minor, that children were typically baptized under the Law, is also denyed.* For though they were in the sea, (so were their Cattell) and though they were in the Cloud, *yet not any were baptized unto* Moses, *but such as did understand the wonders of the Lord, even such as beleeved the Lord, and his Servant* Moses Exodus 14. 31. For it is said, *They did all eate the same spirituall meat, and did all drinke the same spiritu all drinke*: namely, *they did all eate and drink Christ.* Now Christ cannot be eaten and drunk without beleeving. Both the Propositions being thus false, we leave the Conclusion altogether untrue.

Argument 7. *page* 49.

All they who belong to Christ, and his Kingdome, ought to be received into the Church by Baptisme. *Dr. Featly.*

But children belong to Christ and his kingdome, as Christ himselfe teacheth us, Mark 10. 14. Luke 10. 16. *Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdome of God. Verily, I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdome of God as a little childe, he shall not enter therein,* Verse 15. *And he tooke them up in his armes, and put his hands upon them, and blessed them.*

Ergo, *Children ought to be admitted into the Church by* Baptisme.

Mr. Marſhal. pag. 42

Suffer them to come unto me, and forbid them not, becauſe of ſuch is the kingdome of God. That is my Church and Kingdome is made up of thoſe, as well as of others.

I will anſwer this, and the following Arguments, with more brevity, than I have anſwered the former. And I doe deny the major, or firſt Propoſition, *viz. All that belong unto the Kingdome of Chriſt, ought not to be received into the Church by Baptiſme.* A perſon may bee ſaid to belong to the Kingdome of Chriſt two wayes. Firſt, by *Election*, which is ſecret. Secondly by *Calling*, which is manifeſt. Now the Ordinance of *Baptiſme* belongeth not unto *Election*, but unto *Calling*.

Now maſter Marſhalls dealing is obſervable, who ſaith, that Chriſt ſaith, his Church and Kingdom conſiſteth of ſuch: where hee addeth the word Church, which Chriſt expreſſeth not, and therefore wee will charge him with addition of more unto the text, than is found therein. And we give him to underſtand that many belong the Kingdome of God, who doe not belong to the Church of God. And theſe Infants, whom our Saviour profeſſeth by his divine knowledge, to belong unto his Kingdome, and yet you ſee, that he neither baptized them, nor yet commanded them to bee baptized. Although (I ſay) he knew they belonged unto his Kingdome. With what forehead, dare you baptize infants, when you know not whether they belong to the Kingdome of God or no.

Argument. 8.

Dr. Feasly. Page 50.

All they which receive the grace, both ſignified and exhibited to us in baptizme, may and ought to receive the ſigne and

and Sacrament thereof. This is the Baſis and foundation upon which Saint Peter himſelfe builds, Acts 10. 47. Can any man forbid water that theſe ſhould not be baptiſed, who have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as wee. And it may be further confirmed by an argument drawne à majori ad minus, after this manner, if God beſtow upon children, that which is greater, the inward grace; why ſhould wee deny them the leſſer, the outward Elements? Or by an Argument drawne à relatis: they to whom the Land is given, ought not to bee denyed the ſight and keeping of the Deeds and Evidences thereof: neither ought wee to ſever the things that God hath joyned, to wit, the ſignes and the things ſignified. They divide the ſigne from the thing ſignified, who deny them to have grace ordinarily, modo non ponant obicem, who receive the outward Signe. And they againe ſever the thing ſignified from the ſigne, who allow unto Children the grace of remiſsion of ſinnes & regeneration, and yet deny them the ſigne and ſeale thereof, to wit, Baptiſme.

But children receive the grace ſignified, and exhibited in Baptiſme: for the Apoſtle teacheth us, they are not uncleane, but holy: and therefore have remiſsion of ſins, and ſanctification.

Ergo, Children ought to receive the ſigne and Sacrament thereof, to wit, Baptiſme.

To whom the inward graee of Baptiſme, doth belong, to them belongs the outward ſigne: They ought to have the ſigne, who have the thing ſignified: the earthly part of the Sacrament muſt be given unto them who have the heavenly part. But the Infants of Beleevers, even while they are Infants, are made partakers of the inward grace of Baptiſme, of the heavenly and ſpirituall part, as Mr. Marſhal. page 41.

grownemen. Therefore they may, and ought to receive the outward signe of Baptisme.

I will Answer this deceitfull and pudled, and confonnded Argument, by denyall of the *major*, and by laying downe in briefe, certaine Propositions to cleare it may be that which is here so full of confusion.

1. Prop. *That children have the grace, mercy, and favour of God.*

2. Prop. *Children have not the knowledge of this grace and mercy.*

3. *Not they who have received grace and mercy: But they who have received manifestation of grace, ought to bee Baptized.*

4. *That* Peter *Acts* 10. *speaketh not onely of mercy and grace given, but also of mercie and grace manifested.*

5. *That neither Children, nor Dr. Featly, nor Mr. Marshall, have yet received the gift whereof Peter speaks Act.* 10.

6. *That Children may be holy in Gods imputation.*

7. *That Children are not holy in conscience and manifestation.*

8. That in the sence whereof the Apostle spake, *Children are not otherwise holy, than the unbeleeving husband, who is sanctified: else were your children unclean, that is ought to be put away. But now are they holy, you may remain with them still. See Mr. Marshall, page* 19. *and Nehem.* 13.25. *See Ezra* 10. 3.

9. *No unbeleever ought to be Baptized, Acts* 8.36.

10. *A child may have right to land, which may not keep the Deeds.*

11. *A person may have the greater, to whom the lesser is denyed.* Otherwise, why doe you deny the Supper to Children, who as you say, have the heavenly grace, and gift of the holy Ghost. *Ar-*

Argument 9.

All Apostolicall traditions, which are truely such ought to be had in reverent esteeme, and retained in the Church. For what the Apostles delivered, they received from Christ himselfe, either by word of mouth, or the infallible inspiration of his Spirit. Such things are part of that Sacrum depositum, *which* Timothy *is charged so deeply to keep. O* Timothy *keep that which is committed unto thee. And the Thessalonians to stand fast, and keep* Paradoseis, *word for word: the traditions which you have beene taught, either by word, or by our Epistle. But the Baptisme of children is an Apostolicall tradition, truly so called.* *Dr. Featly. Page 52.*

Ergo, *It ought to be had in high esteem, and retained in the Church.*

Origen *saith, the Church received the tradition of Baptizing Infants from the Apostles, traditions being onely such things as are delivered from one to another; whether written, or unwritten.* *Mr. Marshal. pag. 4.*

Answ. What will you have? will you bring us back to unwritten traditions againe: if your tradition bee unwritten, why doe you impose it upon us?

To prove that it is a Tradition, you alledge *Austin, Prosper, Ierom, Cyprian, Origen,* &c. And in the front of your Book *Gregory Nazianzen.*

Vnto the Testimony of *Gregory*, I shall answer in the first place: that in the place and words cyted by your selfe, *Gregory* doth restraine it unto *danger*, saying, *if there be any danger.* But what if there be no danger, then let them stay TRIETIAN, &c. Three years, (saith *Nazianzen*) lesse, or more, untill they be able to heare and answer.

And theſe words in the Author doe immediately follow the place quoted by the Doctor. And he himſelfe confeſſed unto me, that he knew that this was the Authors opinion, that (time of danger excepted) Children ought not to be Baptized before they could heare and anſwer. And yet hath he with great fraud, hidden this from the hearers. Iudge I pray you, whether this be Chriſtian dealing, or not. And what was the Cuſtome in thoſe dayes? whether to huddle with children to the Font or no, may appeare by the example of *Nazianzen* himſelfe: His Father was a Biſhop, his mother a vertuous Woman, famous in wonders, yet was not hee himſelfe Baptized untill thirty yeares of age.

When he ſayled unto *Athens*, (as I take it) being of perfect age, OUDEPOO SPHRAGISTHEIS BAETISMATI, he was not yet ſealed with Baptiſme. And in the ſtory of his life, it is ſayd, TRIAKOSTON ETOS, &c. He was Baptized when he was full thirty yeares of age: either then the father of *Gregory*, and his mother did not know this Tradition, or elſe they did wilfully tranſgreſſe it. But againſt the Authorities brought, I ſhall alledge one, who is more ancient than any that they can truely cyte: (for *Iuſtin Martyr* is fraudulently cited by Mr. *Marſhall*, his owne Conſcience perſwading him, that it was not *Iuſtins* Booke which goes under his name, as appeares in Mr. *Marſhall*, page 3.) *Tertullian* is the man, who in the latter end of his Sermon concerning Baptiſme, diſputes who are to be Baptized, and determines it thus, *omni petenti dato*, give to every one that asketh it. *Ætate cunctatio Baptiſmi utilior*, &c: The deferring of Baptiſme

tiſme, is more profitable in age: But eſpecially concerning children, of whom he ſaith, *fiant Chriſtiani cum Chriſtum noſſe potuerint.* Let them be made Chriſtians when they are able to know Chriſt, with many ſuch like things in the ſame place, one whereof I cannot forget, *Quid enim neceſſe eſt (ſi non tam neceſſe eſt) ſponſores, etiam periculo, ingeri?* What need is there for Godfathers to bee brought in in the time of danger? where he concludes, that Iuſants have no need of Baptiſme. But one thing I may not paſſe by, viz. That thoſe words, (*Si non tam neceſſe*) are confeſſed to bee added to the Author by the Commentator, that hee might mitigate the Authors opinion concerning *Baptiſme of Infants.* When I look upon this dealing, and conſider what the Doctor hath done in the citation of *Nazianzen*, I have cauſe to ſay, as did your Fathers, ſo doe yee.

For the authority of *Auſtin*, I anſwer, that *Ludovicus vives*, a man well skild in *Auſtin*, beleeved no ſuch matter: for in his Annotations upon the 27. *chap* of the 1 Book *De Civ. Dei*, he hath theſe words, *Olim nemiem conſuevisſe Baptizari, &c. That of old it was the cuſtome to baptize none, unleſſe they were of full age, and did deſire Baptiſme in their own perſons, and did underſtand what it was to be Baptized.* And Cardinall *Bellarm.* confeſſeth, that *Eraſmus* was of the ſame mind. What becomes of your Apoſtolicall tradition?

Argument. 10.

All members of the Reformed Proteſtant Churches in Chriſtendome ought to conforme their judgements to the harmony of the Proteſtant Confeſſions, ſet forth by the conſent of all Orthodox Churches, and firmly grounded upon Deductions, at leaſt of holy Scripture, if not evident Texts. Dr. Fearly. page 53.

But

But the judgement of all the Reformed Churches, delivered in the harmony of their Confessions, is professedly for the Baptisme of Infants, & expressely against this tenet of the Anabaptists.

Ergo, *Let the Anabaptists with it, Disclaim the name of Protestants, & Children of the Reformed Churches, or renounce this their heresie: for* Turpis pars quæ non congruit toti.

Answer. O man full of Subtilty: How long will you labour to deceive? You have left out some words inserted in your major, viz. firmely grounded upon holy Scripture. We grant that these Confessions by you cited doe seek to establish Baptisme of Infants, But that these confessions are in this poynt grounded upon Scripture, is the thing we deny. And this is that wee doe professe, that whersoever the Protestant Confessions doe goe hand in hand with holy Scripture, we doe rejoyce to follow them. But if they have swerved from the line, their example must not be our president: for wee have a more sure word of prophesie, whereunto yee do well, that yee take heed as unto a light shining in a darke place, untill the day dawne, and the day-starre appeare in your hearts, 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. I answer againe, as Card. *Bellarmin* well and truely observeth. The Protestants doe confesse the Bapt. of Infants with the mouth; but yet the whole course of their owne positions do indeed overthrow it. And I can prove, that the Church of *England* in maintaining the Baptisme of Infants, swerveth from her owne principles. But I will goe no farther at this time; onely I shall intreat the Lord to open the eyes of those that in this poynt cannot yet see: that they may consider with understanding what hath been written.

FINIS.

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN TH

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRA

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTI